

IN THE CLAIMS

In claim 10, ~~delete~~ "plasticizer"; replace therefore —second material—.

Add a — at the end of claims 4 and 10.

8/17
24. (Amended) A method according to claim 1, wherein said admixture [contains a polyaniline] further includes monomer of said precursor, [said additive] and an oxidant.

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of any changes to the claims and the remarks herein. Please contact the undersigned to conduct a telephone interview in accordance with MPEP 713.01 to resolve any remaining requirements and/or issues prior to sending another Office Action. Relevant portions of MPEP 713.01 are included on the signature page of this amendment.

In response to the obviousness type double patenting rejection a terminal disclaimer in view of US 5,969,024 will be submitted when claims are found allowable herein.

Claims 24 and 40-42 have been rejected under 35 USC 112. Applicants do not understand how the Examiner's Comments relate to claim 24 which recites "a monomer, of said precursor and said oxidant". If an oxidative polymerization were done there would be monomers and oxidants in the solution. Also, monomer and oxidants could be subsequently added. Claim 24 has been amended to clarify the language. As to claims 40-45 an additive, a plasticizer and a material as claimed can be an oxidant in addition to having other properties. In view thereof, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/346,353

- 2 -

Docket No. YO996-049BX

Claims 5 and 9 have been rejected under 35 USC 112 for use of the terminology "substituted". Applicants disagree. US 5,198,153, incorporated by reference at page 9, last 2 lines, describes substituted polymers useful to practice the present invention.

Note that the term "substituted" is proper when modifying a chemical group: 1. if the term is defined or 2. if the guidelines are present in the specification or 3. if sufficient examples are given so one of ordinary skill in the art could determine what substituents may be used. Note In re Conley, 490 F.2d. 972, 180 USPQ 454; In re Sus et al., 134 USPQ 301. In view thereof, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for use of the term "substituents". This is a well understood term in the art. In view thereof, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 10 and 2 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. These claims have been amended to overcome these rejection. Thus withdrawal is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated or under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Han, Ikkala et al. or Cao et al. The Examiner points to no teaching in these references to support the statement. There is no teaching of isotopic electrical conductivity in these references and the materials of these references are not made in the same way as applicants' materials. There is no suggestion in these references that isotopic electrical conductivity can exist in an electrically conductive polymer. In view thereof, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16, 20, 22, 23 and 25 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obviousness over an in view of Cao et al. The Examiner only comments on claim 6

Serial No. 09/346,353

- 3 -

Docket No. YO996-049BX

pointing to where Cao et al. teaches stretch orientation. The examiner ignores the rest of the limitations in these claims for which there is no teaching or suggestions in Cao et al. In view thereof, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16, 20, 22, 23 and 25 have been rejected :

1) under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Han or under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Han

and

2) under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Cao et al. or under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Cao et al.

In each rejection, respectively, the Examiner states:

"The recited plasticizers of Han would not substantially dissolve polyanilines in the absence of a solvent, and would provide local mobility to polyanilines. The recited plasticizers of Han would not substantially dissolve in polyanilines neither."

"The recited plasticizers of Cao would not substantially dissolve polyanilines in the absence of a solvent, and would provide local mobility to polyanilines. The recited plasticizers of Cao would not substantially dissolve in polyanilines."

In these statements the Examiner acknowledges that neither Han nor Cao et al. teach using a solvent as claimed by applicants. Thus, these claims cannot be anticipated by Han or Cao et al. and thus the rejection of these claims under 35 USC 102(b) are respectfully requested to be withdrawn. In these statements the Examiner adds information not taught in Han or Cao et al., but which is taught by applicants, i.e.,

Serial No. 09/346,353

- 4 -

Docket No. YO996-049BX

the use of a solvent. The Examiner is using applicants teaching to add to Han and Cao et al. This is improper. Applicants request the Examiner to produce references to support the Examiner's statements or an Affidavit as provided for under 37 CFR 104(d)(2) for the Examiner to qualify himself as an expert to make these statements, or to withdraw this rejection. In view thereof, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

In view of the changes to the claims and the remarks herein, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the above-identified application. If the Examiner wishes to discuss the application further, or if additional information would be required, the undersigned will cooperate fully to assist in the prosecution of this application.

Please charge any fee necessary to enter this paper and any previous paper to deposit account 09-0468.

If the above-identified Examiner's Action is a final Action, and if the above-identified application will be abandoned without further action by applicants, applicants file a Notice of Appeal to the Board of Appeals and Interferences appealing the final rejection of the claims in the above-identified Examiner's Action. Please charge deposit account 09-0468 any fee necessary to enter such Notice of Appeal.

In the event that this amendment does not result in allowance of all such claims, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone interview at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

MPEP 713.01 states in part as follows:

Where the response to a first complete action includes a request for an interview or a telephone consultation to be initiated by the examiner, ...

Serial No. 09/346,353

- 5 -

Docket No. YO996-049BX

OFFICIAL
FAX RECEIVED
NOV 29 2000
GROUP 1700

the examiner, as soon as he or she has considered the effect of the response, should grant such request if it appears that the interview or consultation would result in expediting the case to a final action.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Dr. Daniel P. Morris, Esq.
Reg. No. 32,053
Phone No.: (914) 945-3217

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
P. O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598

Serial No. 09/346,353

- 6 -

Docket No. YO996-049BX

** TOTAL PAGE.06 **

11/29/00 WED 16:52 [TX/RX NO 9550] 006